

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/821,096	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KUROSE, TSUTOMU	
	<b>Examiner</b> Michael Burleson	<b>Art Unit</b> 2626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Burleson.

(3) Luan Do.

(2) Kimberly A. Williams.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 24 January 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 5-8.

Identification of prior art discussed: Fujiwara (US 6775031).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*KAWilliams*

**KIMBERLY WILLIAMS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Do proposed an amendment to distinguish over the 112 rejection. Specifically in the third step, either a non-half tone pixel is converted to a half tone pixel, or a pixel that has already been converted to a half tone pixel previously is compared to a density threshold and if the pixel is equal to or greater than the threshold is modified (again) to a half tone pixel. This is felt to distinguish over Fujiwara, which Mr. Do emphasized converts non half tone to half tone but fails to teach the modification of the previous half tone pixel. The examiner will reconsider Fujiwara in view of the remarks.